Robert E. Aycock [8878]
William O. Kimball [9460]
PIA ANDERSON MOSS HOYT, LLC
136 East South Temple, 19th Floor
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: 801-350-9000
RAycock@pa-law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

bkimball@pa-law.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

'S PLANNING EPORT
-cv-00963
-

1. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

a. The nature of the claims and affirmative defenses is: the dissemination of confidential, proprietary and trade secret information and the subsequent efforts to undermine and harm the Plaintiff. Defendants Luong and Planet Express have filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and improper venue or, in the alternative, to transfer venue. Defendants do not waive any jurisdictional objection by cooperating in or submitting this Planning Report. Additionally, Defendants intend to file one or more motions for judgment on the pleadings and intend to assert counter-claims once jurisdictional matters have been resolved. No date has yet been set for Defendants' jurisdictional motion, and no date will be set until the matter is reassigned to a district judge. In the event there is substantial delay in assigning and determining Defendants' motion, Defendants would seek to alter the proposed deadlines below.

b.	This case isnot referred to a magistrate judge			
	referred to magistrate judge			
	under 636(b)(1)(A)			
	under 636(b)(1)(B)			
	X assigned to a magistrate judge under General Order 07-001			
	and			
	all parties consent to the assignment for all			
	proceedings or			
	X one or more parties request reassignment to a district			
	judge			
c.	Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), a meeting was held on October 18, 2017 by			
	telephonic conference.			
	The following attended:			
	Will Chadwick, counsel for SHIPITO, LLC,			
	Alan Engle, counsel for JASON LUONG and PLANET EXPRESS			
	SHIPPING, LLC			
d.	The parties request /Xdo not request an initial pretrial scheduling			
	conference with the court prior to entry of the scheduling order. An initial pretrial			
	scheduling conference is set before Magistrate Judge Evelyn J. Furse on			
	11/8/2017 at 11:30am.			
e.	The parties have exchanged or X will exchange by 11/22/17 the			
	initial disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1).			
f.	Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(D), the parties agree to receive all items			
	required to be served under Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(a) by either (i) notice of electronic			
	filing, or (ii) e-mail transmission. Such electronic service will constitute service			
	and notice of entry as required by those rules. Any right to service by USPS mail			
	is waived.			
DISC	COVERY PLAN: The parties jointly propose to the court the following discovery			

plan: Use separate paragraphs or subparagraphs as necessary if the parties disagree.

Discovery is necessary on the following subjects: SHIPITO LLC's allegation of the misappropriation of confidential, proprietary and trade secret information; the

2.

use of this information in the formation of a copycat business; and breach of contract.

- b. Discovery Phases: Discovery will not be conducted in phases.
- c. Designate the discovery methods to be used and the limitations to be imposed.
 - (1) Oral Exam Depositions

Plaintiff(s): 10

Defendant(s): 10

Maximum no. hrs. per deposition: 7

(2) Interrogatories: <u>25</u>

Admissions (other than Requests for Authentication): 25

Requests for production of documents: 125

Requests for Authentication: **Unlimited**

- (3) Other discovery methods:
- d. Discovery of electronically stored information should be handled as follows:

The Parties have met and conferred pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) regarding reasonable and proportionate steps taken to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action. The Parties reserve the right to submit a stipulated proposal regarding how discovery of electronically stored information should proceed.

e. The parties have agreed to an order regarding claims of privilege or protection as trial preparation material asserted after production, as follows:

Pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 502(d), the production of a privileged or work-product-protected document, whether inadvertent or otherwise, is not a waiver of privilege or protection from discovery in this case or in any other federal or state proceeding. For example, the mere production of privileged or work-product-protected documents in this case as part of a mass production is not itself a waiver in this case or in any other federal or state proceeding. The Parties reserve the right to submit a stipulated protective order.

- f. Last day to file written discovery: 08/27/18
- g. Close of fact discovery: <u>09/24/18</u>
- h. (optional) Final date for supplementation of disclosures under Rule 26 (a)(3) and of discovery under Rule 26 (e): 02/22/19

	AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS AND ADDITION OF PARTIES: a. The cutoff dates for filing a motion to amend pleadings are: <i>specify date</i>					
		Plaintiff(s): <u>03/20/18</u> Defendant(s): <u>04/20/18</u>				
	b. The cutoff dates for filing a motion to join additional parties are: <i>speci</i>					
		Plaintiff(s): <u>03/20/18</u> Defendants(s): <u>04/20/18</u>				
	(NOTE: Establishing cutoff dates for filing motions does not relieve coufrom the requirements of Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a)).					
4.	EXP	PERT REPORTS:				
	Repo	orts from experts under Rule 26(a)(2) will be submitted on: specify dates				
		Parties bearing burden of proof: <u>09/24/18</u>				
		Response: <u>11/26/18</u>				
5.	OTHER DEADLINES:					
	a.	Expert Discovery cutoff: <u>12/24/18</u>				
	b.	Deadline for filing dispositive ¹ or potentially dispositive motions including				
		motions to exclude experts where expert testimony is required to prove the case:				
	<u>01/18/19</u>					
	c.	Deadline for filing partial or complete motions to exclude expert testimony				
		<u>02/19/19</u>				
6.	ADF	R/SETTLEMENT:				
	Use	separate paragraphs/subparagraphs as necessary if the parties disagree.				
	a.	The potential for resolution before trial is:good _X_ fairpoor				
	b.	This case should be referred to the court's alternative dispute resolution program				
		for arbitration: mediation:X				
	c.	c. The parties intend to engage in private alternative dispute resolution for				
		arbitration: mediation:				
d.	The	parties will re-evaluate the case for settlement/ADR resolution on: <u>11/26/18</u> .				
	TRI	AL AND PREPARATION FOR TRIAL:				

¹ Dispositive motions, if granted, affect the final resolution of the case; nondispositive motions, if granted, affect the case but do not dispose of it.

Case 2:17-cv-00963-BCW Document 19 Filed 10/18/17 Page 5 of 5

a.	The parties should have 14 days after	service of final lists of witnesses and
	exhibits to list objections under Rule 26(a	a)(3) (if different than 14 days provided
	by Rule).	
b.	This case should be ready for trial by:	03/25/19
		Jury X Bench
c.	The estimated length of the trial is:	<u>3-4 days</u>
		Date: / /
Signature as	nd typed name of Plaintiff(s) Attorney	
		Date://
Signature an	nd typed name of Defendant(s) Attorney	

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

The Report of the Attorney Planning Meeting should be completed and filed with the Clerk of the Court twenty-one days before the date of the Initial Pretrial Conference. A copy of the Proposed Scheduling Order on the court's official form should be submitted in word processing format by email to ipt@utd.uscourts.gov. If counsel meet, confer, and

- (i) file a stipulated Attorney Planning Meeting Report and
- (ii) email a draft scheduling order in word processing format by email to ipt@utd.uscourts.gov

twenty-one days before the scheduled hearing, the Court will consider entering the Scheduling Order based on the filed Attorney Planning Meeting Report.

If the Hearing is held, counsel should bring a copy of the Attorney Planning Meeting Report to the Hearing.

In CM/ECF, this document should be docketed as Other Documents - Attorney Planning Meeting.

More information is available at

http://www.utd.uscourts.gov/documents/ipt.html

Other Documents

Attorney Planning Meeting

Next Clear